

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated March 9, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-41 are currently pending and stand rejected. Claims 10, 18, 25, and 30 have been amended.

Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in a telephone interview with the Examiner on November 14, 2006. During the interview, claims that referred to Internet sites such as claim 37 were discussed in relation to the deficiency of the cited references in this regard. Claims that referred to a voicemail system receiving the numeric option assignments such as in claim 8 were also discussed in relation to the deficiency of the cited references. Additionally, it was discussed that the cited references fail to disclose assigning numeric options where those options are associated with ports to which archival devices are connected.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30, 31, 33, 35-38, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Ortega (US Pat 6,535,848) in view of Jambhekar (US Pat 6,430,405). Additionally, claims 3, 6, 20, 23, 32, 34, and 39 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Jambhekar and allegedly admitted prior art. Claims 10, 11, 13-15, and 17 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Jambhekar and further in view of Padmanabhan (US Pat 6,219,638). Claims 12 and 16 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Jambhekar, Padmanabhan, and allegedly admitted prior art. Claims 25-27 and 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Jambhekar, Padmanabhan, and further in view of Damiba (US Pub 2002/0169605). Claim 28 is rejected as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Jambhekar, Padmanabhan, Damiba,

and allegedly admitted prior art. Applicants traverse these rejections to the extent these rejections may apply to the currently pending claims.

Claims 1 and 37

These claims recite subject matter involving assignments being received via an Internet site. Claim 1 recites, “an Internet site of a service provider that receives recipient-designated assignments of numeric options to archival devices....” Similarly, claim 37 recites “accessing, by a recipient, an Internet site of a service provider; assigning, by the recipient at the Internet site, a numeric option to each of a plurality of archival devices....”

None of the cited references, particularly Ortega and Jambhekar, describe these recitations. As has been conceded, Ortega does not describe such assignment of numeric options to archival devices. It has been asserted that Jambhekar discloses assignment of numeric options. Jambhekar discloses a mobile phone that includes a contact list as shown in FIG. 6-5 and discussed at col. 7. The list shows the options being numbered in sequence. To the extent this list of contact numbers can be considered a set of archival devices having numeric options assigned to them by the recipient, Jambhekar fails to describe that such assignments are made via an Internet site. To the contrary, Jambhekar merely describes that the user makes selections from the contact list menu and fails to disclose such assignments being made by the user via an Internet site. None of the other cited references account for these deficiencies.

Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose all of the elements of claims 1 and 37 such that these claims are allowable over the cited combination for at least these reasons. Depending claims 2-9 and 38-41 depend from an allowable base claim and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 8

Claim 8 recites subject matter regarding a voicemail system. In particular, claim 8 recites:

a voicemail message system for receiving input to create recipient-designated assignments of archival devices to numeric options...for prompting the recipient to select a numeric option for the recorded message after the recorded message

has been played back... for receiving a selection of one of the numeric options from the recipient to transcribe the recorded message in response to the prompt and send the transcribed message to the archival device corresponding to the selected numeric option....”

None of the cited references, particularly Ortega and Jambhekar, describe these recitations. As discussed above, the Office Action has conceded that Ortega fails to describe the assignment of numeric options for archival devices. However, to the extent Jambhekar discloses the mobile device having a contact list that has a numeric option assigned to a telephone number of an archival device, there is no disclosure that a voicemail system receives input to create recipient-designated assignments. The Jambhekar reference is merely a mobile device with a contact list, not a voicemail system. Thus, it is illogical to combine a menu of a mobile phone for purposes of outbound calls from the mobile phone with a system such as that of Ortega since the mobile phone menu is not a voicemail system and is therefore inapplicable to a system such as that of Ortega. None of the other cited references account for these deficiencies.

Accordingly, claim 8 is allowable over the cited combination of references for at least these reasons. Dependent claim 9 depends from an allowable claim 8 and is also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 10, 18, 25, and 30

These claims recite similar subject matter regarding ports connected to archival devices where the numeric options are assigned and associated with the ports. As a representative example of these recitations, claim 10 recites:

a plurality of ports of the converting device for directly interfacing the converting device to each of the plurality of archival devices, each of the ports being associated with the assigned numeric options such that the converting device outputs the transcribed message via the port that is associated with the chosen numeric option.

The specification discloses outlet ports 314, 315, 316, and 317 at paragraph 0035 and in FIG. 3 where the direct interface of the ports of the converting device 321 to the archival devices 304, 305, 306, and 307 is shown.

None of the cited references, particularly Ortega and Jambhekar, disclose a plurality of ports where the recipient assignments of the numeric options are associated with the ports. It has been conceded that Ortega fails to disclose recipient assignment of numeric options to the archival devices. To the extent Jambhekar discloses recipient assignment of numeric options to archival devices via the contact list menu associating a menu item number to a phone number of a recipient device, the association to the phone number is not an association to a port that directly interfaces the converting device to the archival device. To the contrary, the phone number of Jambhekar is not a port of the converting device but is merely a telephone line of a telecommunication network. Furthermore, the phone number of Jambhekar which implicates the telecommunication network is not a direct interface between the converting device and the archival device since the telecommunication network and its various switches and other components is necessarily in between the two. None of the other cited references account for these deficiencies.

Accordingly, claims 10, 18, 25, and 30 are allowable over the cited combination for at least these reasons. Furthermore, claims 11-17, 19-24, 26-29, and 31-36 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-41 is in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due as a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment for failure to receive the Office Action is included. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 29, 2006

/Jeramie J. Keys/
Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093